DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 290 CE 053 388

AUTHOR Mezel, Jamal Assad; Strong, Merle E.
TITLE Consequences of Centralization and Decentralization in Vocational Administration--A Comparison of Vocational Administration in Iraq and United States.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Centralization; Comparative Analysis; *Decentralization; Delivery Systems; *Educational Administration; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Iraq; *United States

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the history, organization, and administration of vocational education in the United States and Iraq, contrasting the highly centralized Iraqi system with the decentralized system in the United States. The paper also compares and contrasts the possible strengths and weaknesses of the two systems in terms of their organization, administration, and potential for efficiency and effectiveness. The paper presents a number of conclusions that point to the centralization of the Iraqi system as being superior in meeting that country's job training needs, but it also points out that Iraq is a small, culturally homogeneous country and that what works there would be much harder to implement in the much larger, culturally diverse United States. Recommendations are made for more local control of vocational education in Iraq and more leadership of vocational education by the federal government in the United States. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311290

Consequences of Centralization and Decentralization in Vocational Administration – A Comparison of Vocational Administration in Iraq and United States

by

Dr. Jamal Assad Mezel

Assistant Professor
Department of Education and Psychology
University of Mosul-Iraq

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

and

Dr. Merle E. Strong

Director
Vocational Studies Center
and
Professor
Department of Educational Administration
University of Wisconsin-Madison

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M E Strong
Vocational Studies Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

University of Wisconsin-Madison
United States, 1989

CE053388

Introduction

This paper is designed to provide a description of the organization and administration of vocational education in the United States and Iraq. The two systems provide a dramatic contrast, in that the system in Iraq is highly centralized, while the system in the United States is quite decentralized.

In addition to describing the two systems, the systems will be compared and contrasted in terms of possible strengths and weaknesses in their organization, administration and potential for being effective and efficient.

It is not the intent of this paper to indicate that one system is superior to the other because each system operates within a societal and governmental context that is quite different. However, the opportunity to compare and contrast systems should be constructive to considering improvements for each system.

The Administration of Vocational Education in the United States

This section of the paper will deal with a description of the present system of organization and administration of vocational education in the US. The role and functions of the national state and local levels will be described. Since the system is quite decentralized it will not be possible to include explanations of the details of each state and local area but information will be provided that should be helpful to understanding the system in a broad context. Some historical background will be provided in order to show how the system has evolved over time.

Federal Level

Historically the federal government has had a concern for vocational education for many years with the first legislation being the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, P.L. 64-347. The purpose of this act was stated as follows:

> An Act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure.

It is noted that the legislation does not speak of providing or controlling vocational education, rather it speaks of promoting and cooperating with the states. The United States Constitution makes clear that the responsibility for

education rests with the states. However, under the "general welfare clause" found in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, authority is provided to expend funds for the support of education and for other purposes judged to be necessary for the welfare of the nation. Federal authority does not include the control of states's educational policies.

The Smith-Hughes Act has been a model for vocational legislation that has been maintained as somewhat symbolic legislation because of its many provisions that have not only stood the test of time but upon which other legislation has been based. Among the features is; the cooperative relationship that was established with the states, the provision for matching federal dollars with state and local dollars, and the provision of a state plan to be developed by the state spelling out how the state would provide vocational education within the conditions of the federal act.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 was a grant in perpetuity and therefore remains with an annual appropriation of approximately $7.2 million dollars. Additional federal legislation has been passed over the years authorizing additional funding and broadening the role of vocational education.

States were not required to participate in the use of federal funds which is still the case for all education legislation. However, it is easily understood that the Congress of the United States has a responsibility to assure that funds appropriated are spent for the purposes intended.

One might argue that the federal government has had a great influence on education, and vocational education in particular, through funding. In the case of vocational education a figure of approximately one dollar out of ten is estimated to come from the federal government for vocational education nationally at the time this is written. While it was indicated that states have never been forced to accept federal funds appropriated for vocational education and thus the conditions under which funds must be spent, all states presently and since the first legislation for vocational education have chosen to participate.

The major funding source for vocational education at this time is the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, P.L. 98-524 passed October 19, 1984. An appropriation of approximately $900 million will be provided for the 1988 fiscal year. It can be noted that its purpose resembles the purpose of the Smith-Hughes Act, however, is much broader in its scope.

> To amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen and expand the economic base of the Nation, develop human resources, reduce structural unemployment, increase productivity, and strengthen the Nation's defense capabilities by assisting the States to expand, improve, and update high quality programs of vocational-technical education, and for other purposes.

The act included the following more specific purposes:

1. to assist the states to expand, improve, modernize, and develop quality vocational education programs in order to meet the needs of the nation's existing and future workforce for marketable skills and to improve productivity and promote economic growth;

2. to assure that individuals are inadequately served under vocational education programs, specially individuals who are disadvantaged, who are handicapped, men and women who are entering nontraditional occupations, adults who are in need of training and retraining, individuals who are single parents or homemakers, individuals with limited English proficiency, and individuals who are incarcerated in correctional institutions;

3. to promote greater cooperation between public agencies and the private sector in preparing individuals for employment, in promoting the quality of vocational education in the states, and in making the vocational system more responsive to the labor market in the states;

4. to improve the academic foundations of vocational students and to aid in the application of newer technologies (including the use of computers) in terms of employment or occupational goals;

5. to provide vocational education services to train, retrain, and upgrade employed and unemployed workers in new skills for which there is a demand in that state or employment market;

6. to assist the most economically depressed areas of a state to raise employment and occupational competencies of its citizens;

7. to assist the states to utilize a full range of supportive services, special programs, and guidance counseling and placement to achieve the basic purposes of this Act.

8. to improve the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education and to reduce the limiting effects of sex-role stereotyping on occupations, job skills, levels of competency, and careers; and

9. to authorize national programs designed to meet designated vocational education needs to strengthen the vocational education research process.

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act established basic state grant programs as the primary Federal method for funding vocational education. States may subtract up to 7 percent of the funds for state-level administrative costs, and the remainder is split in the following manner: Title II, Part A, allocates 57 percent among six specific target groups, and Title II, Part B, allocates 43 percent to 25 categories of program improvement, innovation, and expansion. Not counting the funds subtracted for administrative costs, the funds are distributed in the following proportions:

* Handicapped individuals (10 percent)
* Disadvantaged individuals (22 percent)
* Adults in need of training or retraining (12 percent)
* Single parents or homemakers (8.5 percent)
* Participants in programs to eliminate sex bias and stereotyping (3.5 percent)
* Criminal offenders in correctional institutions (1 percent)
* And 25 categories of program improvement, innovation, and expansion (43 percent).

For two of these Perkins categories (Handicapped and Disadvantaged), the Perkins Act also specifies an interstate formula to be used by the states in allocating Federal funds. For the remaining categories, allocation methods are left to the states discretion. Even for the categories of Handicapped and Disadvantaged, however, considerable discretion is left to the states. For example, states are not told how to allocate funds between secondary and postsecondary education.

The Perkins Act also mandates that the U.S. Department of Education conduct a national assessment of vocational education to describe and evaluate vocational education. (National Center for Education Statistics, 1988, p. 1)

Administration of the funds appropriated by Congress, the leadership for assisting the states and the compliance for spending funds for the purposes provided is lodged in the Executive Branch under the Department of Education. A deputy secretary and staff carry out these functions.

The acceptance of the States and their willingness to participate in federal funding and the conditions imposed is a reflection of the policy making process at the national level. Laws are passed by the Congress whose members are made up of elected officials from the states.

In the American system, the development of public policy is ideally the responsibility of all citizens. To a great extent, this responsibility is carried out through elected representatives. In theory, at least, national policy making is a function of Congress which passes all legislation. In actuality; however, the Executive branch and independent and regulatory agencies establish rules and regulations designed to interpret and implement legislation passed by Congress.

In addition to the respective departments involved in policy making, the Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the White House, also plays a major role in developing the national budget and the determination of proposed allocation of public funds. The Judicial branch , in more recent years, has played an increasing important role through decisions rendered by the Federal courts. The decisions are as binding as any laws and have far reaching implications for education.

As one looks at how policy is developed, the major questions relate to who influences policy making and what are the vehicles through which effective communication takes place. Campbell, et. al., (1962), developed a flow chart

I	II	III	IV
Basic Forces	**Antecedent Movements**	**Political Action**	**Formal Enactment**
Social, economic, political, & technological forces, usually national & worldwide in scope	Usually national in scope such as the National Manpower Commission, Rockefeller Bros., Studies, Conant Studies, etc.	By organizations usually interrelated at local, state & national levels such as U.S. Chamber of Commerce, AFL-CIO, & National Education Association	May be at local, state, & national levels; & through legislative, judicial, & executive agencies

FIGURE I A Flow Chart on Policy Formation in Education

Source: Introduction to Educational Administration, Second Edition. By Roald F. Campbell, et. al. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962.

of policy formulation in education which has served the author well in his attempt to understand the policy making and legislative process. The model is shown as Figure 1.

Campbell (1962) suggested that educators can no longer be concerned chiefly with the formal, legal expressions of policy, but that they must give more attention to political action and to antecedent movements.

Campbell, in speaking about the model, said:

> ...we note that educational policy has its genesis in basic social change; its generation in antecedent movements; its promotion by educators and by citizens in and out of government; and its formulation in legal expressions by local, state, or national government. (Campbell, p. 246)

Since basic social changes are usually nationwide if not international in scope and the antecedent movements are nationwide as well, much of the major decision making is pushed up to the Federal level.

Figure 2 projects some of the forces that will come to bear on the legislation for vocational education that is evolving at the present time. While the explanation of policy making may be a bit simplistic and the entries in Figure 2 are only illustrative, one can glean that development of policy at the national level and in turn legislation is somewhat of a "bottom up" process.

I	II	III	IV
Basic Forces	**Antecedent Movements**	**Political Action**	**Formal Enactment**
National debt, balance of payment deficit, conflicts between and among countries, concern for productivity, manufacturing moving off shore, concern for equal rights of money, minorities and handicapped, concern for school drop outs and rate of illiteracy	National Assessment of Vocational Education reports mandated by the Perkins Act, Unfinished Agenda, numerous studies and other literature on the quality of education, business and industry literature on what is needed in education to increase productivity	American Vocational Association, American Association of Community & Junior Colleges, AFL-CIO and other labor groups, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Independent lobby groups, National School Board Association	Reauthorization of legislation for vocational education at national level, state level legislature may follow also

FIGURE 2 Contemporary Application of Campbell Model to Vocational Education

State Level

As earlier discussed, the Constitution of the United States delegates the responsibility for education and its control to the states. Most state constitutions contain language charging the state legislature with the responsibility for establishing and maintaining a system or systems of public education. The organizational structure for doing this varies among the states. However, the state legislature, within the provisions of the constitution of the particular state tends to have overall responsibility.

Control over education is also exercised by the executive branch of government. The governor, the chief state school officer, the various state boards and other state agencies all participate in school government.

All states have boards of education responsible, usually under the executive branch of government, for providing for education. There is a wide variety of patterns among the states. A few states have a single board responsible for all education. Some states have a board for K-12 education with a separate board or boards for higher education and vocational education. One state has a

unique organization in that the State Superintendent is an elected constitutional officer and there is not a board for K-12 education. However, there is a board for higher education and a separate board for vocational, technical and adult education.

State boards may be elected or appointed. Federal legislation requires that a single state board be identified by the state to be the recipient of federal funds for vocational education and be responsible for their expenditure. As indicated, the pattern of boards for education vary among the states, therefore, their is a difference in the span of control of the various boards among the states. The most common pattern is that the board is a K-12 board, however, it could be the single board for all education for the state, a community college board, or a separate board for vocational education. The assignment of the board to be responsible has historically influenced the program emphasis in the various states and continues to do so.

Vocational education is delivered through a wide range of institutions which vary from state to state. In greatest numbers are the comprehensive high schools. However, at the high school level a large number of states have area schools which may serve high school students on a full time or shared time basis with their home high schools. There are, also, in some states vocational and technical high schools. Many of the institutions serving high school students also serve adults.

At the post high school level the community college is the most common institution across the nation. However, some states have technical institutes, technical colleges or other area school types of arrangements. In addition, technical programs, usually of two years or less, are carried out in four year colleges or universities in a number of states.

Colleges and universities across the nation are involved in teacher training for vocational and technical education, and in research and other supportive types of services.

In summary it can be said that in spite of the federal legislation, there are many differences from state to state in the system of delivery for vocational education. Likewise, there are many similarities. For example, there is a single state board responsible for federal funds. There are programs at the high school, post secondary and adult levels, however, there are differences in the organizational structure for their delivery. The state, legislature within the provisions of the state constitution is considered the primary authority for education. However, the executive branch, the governor and the courts are also prime forces in policy making and direction.

Local Level

At the K-12 level, with the exception of Hawaii, there are local boards of education which operate within the delegated authority from the state. Most commonly these are elected boards with authority to employ staff, build buildings, determine curricula, set graduation standards, develop budgets, and

recommend or in some cases approve local taxation. In general one speaks with pride of the fact that U.S. school systems are local systems with substantial decision making responsibility and authority at the local level. The system has the flexibility to respond to individual needs of a district, therefore, one will find many differences in schools in a single state.

Policy for vocational education at the local level is made by the board of education but with the input of administrators, teachers, students, parents and other leaders in the community. Occupational advisory committees made up of employers and workers have a substantial influence on the development and operation of vocational programs. Organized labor is usually strongly represented on advisory committees where the program relates to occupations that are unionized.

It should be kept in mind , however, that the quality of education is of great concern to the state government and there seems to be a trend to develop stronger guidelines and rules for which local districts must comply. Also, there is a concern for students having equal access to good schools regardless of where they live, so there is often an attempt by the state to provide a guaranteed level of funding for each student or to provide for some other type of at least partial equalization in expenditures which in turn is reflected in program opportunities.

Post Secondary Institutions

The governance structure of vocational education at the post secondary level is dependent upon the organizational structure in the state. The most common type institution is the community college. These are often fully supported, except for student tuition, by state funds and they are often under a board of higher education or perhaps a separate board for community colleges. The control of the institution is strongly influenced by the source of the funds supporting it. Therefore, if the support is primarily from state funds, its policies tend to be established at that level.

Post secondary vocational and technical education in a number of states takes place in technical institutes which have local or district boards made up of membership from the areas they serve. Funding may rely on local property tax as a main source, supplemented by state and federal dollars. These boards like the secondary level boards discussed earlier may have considerable local autonomy in operating the institution. For example, they would hire the head of the institution and staff, approve operating budgets, approve building construction, and develop and operate programs and support services.

The Administration of Vocational Education in Iraq

Education below the university level in Iraq is under the Ministry of Education while higher education is administered by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

Vocational education in high schools is administered by the Ministry of Education, while technical institutes are administered by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. In addition, there are other vocational high schools and technical institutions which belong to different ministries. Examples are, nursing high schools which are administered by the Ministry of Health and the Technical Institute of Communication which is administered by the Ministry of Communication and Transportation. These vocational and technical schools follow the regulations of the respective ministries and are funded and operated by the ministries that relate directly to the occupational areas for which workers are being prepared.

In 1972, Act No. 13 set forth the functions and goals of the Ministry of Education in Iraq. According to this Act, the Ministry of Education was given authority to administer all educational activities from kindergarten through high School. This includes developing educational policies and plans and supervising all educational activities in schools throughout the country. In addition the Act provides all funding and staff to meet the needs for education. (Act No. 13, 1972, Sec. 1)

A similar system of administration has been set up under Act No. 130, passed in 1970, for the administration of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Technical institutes are administered under this Act. (Act. No. 130, 1970)

The vocational education system has three main types of high schools, namely, industrial, agricultural and commercial. These high schools provide general education to their students as well as the skills and related technical information needed to prepare them specifically for their particular occupation. (Ministry of Education, Act. No. 24, 1978, Sec. II)

The vocational high school curriculum is three years in length. Most students enter directly into employment upon completion, in the particular sector for which they have been trained, however, the ten students with the best grades in each school have the right to seek further education in one of the technical institutes or universities.

The duration of study in the technical institutes is two full years. The curriculum consists of practical and applied studies related to the occupational area for which training is being provided. Graduates are usually employed as technicians or assistants to college graduates.

Technical institutes include instruction in a number of occupations within the categories of industrial technology, health, agriculture, commerce, and business administration. These institutes are located throughout the country and are related to the population and occupational needs of the area.

The vocational high schools and technical institutes are restricted to pre-employment training for particular occupations They are not involved in training or retraining for those already employed.

Vocational High School Administration

The administration of vocational high schools is similar to that of the general high schools in which there are three levels of administration, namely, (1) the ministry level (2) the local administrative level, and (3) the school level. Iraq is divided into 18 administrative areas which are referred to as local area.

The Central Level of Administration. The Ministry of Education is the decision making level for the vocational education system. Authority for planning, policy making, funding and supervision of all schools rests with the Ministry as dictated by the legislation.

The Ministry of Education includes an administrative unit called the Foundation of Vocational Education which was founded by Act No. 198 in 1975. This legislation sets forth the functions of the Foundation which are as follows:

1. To plan, fund, regulate, all programs and projects.

2. To establish new schools for specific needs in any region, and at the same time the authority to eliminate or combine schools and departments as required.

3. To communicate and coordinate with all sectors which are involved in vocational education, to regulate and provide requirements for each sector's programs developed by the schools.

4. To prepare both academic and practical training personnel for all vocational schools.

5. To provide the programs, the text books and other educational materials, facilities, equipment, prescription for instructional methods and internal processes of education for job preparation.

6. To contract for and exchange experiences and new methods with institutions in Arab and foreign countries.

7. To provide standards for programs and credit loads for each year of training for advancement of students. In addition to regulate the evaluations, and examinations for graduation of students to obtain the high school diploma and to determine the level of passing of each student.

8. To employ, through the Foundation of Vocational Education, all staff for vocational education.

9. To close the schools for seven days, and longer with the permission of the Ministry of Education.

10. To provide diplomas for graduates.

11. To develop and carry out policies for administration of schools including policies for financing, governance of students and employees, and qualifications, numbers, and salaries of all personnel. (Act. No. 198, 1975, Sec. III, IV, V, XI)

Local Level of Administration

Iraq is divided into 18 regions for the purpose of administration of vocational and general education. Each of these regions has an administrative office headed by the General Director of Education. Among the several assistant directors is an assistant director for vocational education who is responsible for administration and supervision of all programs within the region.

The general director of education in each province is appointed by the Ministry of Education. The assistant directors are also appointed by the Ministry but are recommended by the general director. The general directors are responsible directly to the ministry of education.

The functions of the Office of the General Director of Education in each region are as follows:

1. To apply and supervise the application of the legislation and regulations of the central agencies of education at the national level.

2. To conduct surveys of educational needs in the particular region, such as; number of schools, kinds of schools, building and remodeling, school placements, personnel needs, didactics requirements including textbooks, notebooks, lab instrumentation and other educational materials, facilities, equipment, and prescriptions for instructional methods and internal processes of education.

3. To plan the development of education to meet requirements in the region. The plan has to be approved by the ministry of education before implementation.

4. To supervise all educational activities in the schools of the region.

5. To select the principals of the schools and to appoint them following the approval by the central agencies.

6. To distribute and transfer academic staff in the region according to the needs of each school.

7. To suggest the advancement and salary increases of academic staff, administrative and service personnel.

8. To reward distinguished instructors, administrative and service personnel and to take corrective action for personnel who are not meeting requirements.

9. To supervise final examinations for the vocational high school diploma.

10. To report on educational practices during the academic year.

11. To participate in the Ministry's plan and policy making decisions.

12. To coordinate and cooperate with the administrative agencies in the region in the field of education. (Act. No. 13, 1972, Sec. XVIII)

School Administration

Act no. 24, passed in 1978, provides the administrative structure for all education in Iraq including vocational education. According to the act, the academic and training staff consist of the following:

1. The principal of the vocational school. This position requires at least a university degree and five years experience as a vocational teacher including teaching in both academic and applied subjects. It is possible to appoint a principal who doesn't have experience in vocational education, but the principal must have a university degree and five years of experience in education. This exception to the case requires that his assistant principal must have experience in the field of vocational education.

2. Assistant principal. In each school, there has to be one or more assistant principals. This position requires a university degree in one of the vocational education fields and three years of instructional experience in the vocational schools.

3. The department head. This position requires a university degree in a specific field of vocational education as well as at least three years of teaching experience in the specific field.

4. The instructor. This position requires a university degree in the specific field of vocational education or general education.

5. The teachers and trainers. This position requires a technical college diploma, but in exceptional cases, it is possible to appoint a vocational high school graduate. (Ministry of Education, Act No. 24, 1978, Sec III, IV)

The functions of the principal are to:

1. Apply orders and regulations of the Office of the General Director of Education in the particular region.

2. Supervise the instruction, educational processes, and application of course syllabi in the school.

3. Organize the time table and distribution of loads and courses among the instructors, teachers and trainers.

4. Make requests for all instructional and administrative needs.

5. Maintain the schools properties.

6. Supervise student evaluations and exams as well as the student's advancement and progress.

7. Provide solutions for student's educational and personal problems.

8. Supervise the attendance and performance of the academic, administrative and service personnel.

9. Organize and maintain files for student affairs as well as the administration and financial affairs of the school.

10. To supervise all committees in the school.

11. Regularly organize staff meetings to discuss the different needs and educational affairs of the school.

12. To report regularly on the progress and operation of the school to the office of the General Director of the region.

The assistant principal assists the principal in all of the above functions or activities.

The academic staff is responsible for instruction and education processes including student advancement, as well as guidance and counseling. The instructors in the vocational school have to develop an annual syllabi and must distribute daily and weekly lesson plans. The plans describe the methods of instruction and instrumentation requirements. The instructor is also responsible to develop exams and to evaluate his/her students. In addition the academic staff is required to study the curricula and instructional methods and make suggestions for improvement. (Ministry of Education Act. 24, Sec. V) (Act. 2, 1977, Sec. 22, 23, 24)

Technical Institute Administration

The administration of technical institutes takes place on three levels; a) the central level of administration which is directed by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, b) institute administration which is directed by the dean of the institute, and c) the departmental administration which is directed by the chairperson of the department.

The Central Level of Administration

The Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research is the decision making level for the technical institute system. It is responsible for planning and policy making, funding and supervision of all activities of technical institutes throughout the country.

The Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research delegates administrative authority for these institutes to a special central administrative unit called the Foundation of Technical Institutes. The functions of this foundation are as follows:

1. Planning and development of technical institutes throughout the country as needed.

2. Funding all didactic and scientific activities and new buildings.

3. Communicating and coordinating with all sectors through the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in order to determine their needs and provide needed programs for each sector by the technical institutes.

4. Providing both academic and practical training personnel for all activities in the technical institutes throughout the country.

5. Providing the programs, text books and other educational materials, facilities, and equipment for job preparation.

6. Providing standards for programs and credit load for each year of study for the advancement of students.

7. Employing all staff for technical education through the Ministry of Higher Education.

8. Developing and carrying out general policies for administration in technical institutes including policies for financing, governance of students and employees, qualifications, numbers, and salaries of all personnel. (Act. 130, 1970)

The Institute Level of Administration

Each institute is administered by a dean who is appointed by the respective central agency. The central administration by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research delegates to the dean authority to administer and direct all activities

The dean heads the board of the institute which consists of the (heads) chairpersons of the departments. This board is responsible for administering the policy of the institute which includes the following:

1. To apply and supervise the application of the legislation and regulations of the central agencies at the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

2. To conduct surveys of educational needs in the particular institute such as didactics, academic, technical and personnel needs and also the financial needs to run the projects and administration programs.

3. To supervise all educational and training activities in the institute.

4. To suggest the advancement of the faculty members as well as the salary increases of academic staff, administrative and service personnel.

5. To report on educational practices during the academic year. (Act. 130, 1970)

The Department Administration

Each technical institute consists of many departments which provide different technical programs. The department board is responsible to direct all the academic and training activities in the particular department. The head of the department (chairperson) is responsible:

1. To apply the regulations and policies of the institute.

2. To supervise the educational program including the application of course syllabi in the department.

3. To head all committees in the department.

4. To distribute the courses among the instructors and organize the timetable.

5. To make requests to meet instructional and administrative needs.

6. To provide solutions for academic and educational problems in the department.

7. To report regularly on the progress and operation of the department to the office of the dean.

8. To supervise student evaluations.

9. To monitor the academic promotion of faculty members.

10. To organize department meetings and to make decisions on issues. (Act. 130, 1970)

Influences of Structure on the Delivery System

In considering potential issues related to centralization and decentralization of educational systems among the countries of the world, it must be recognized that it would not be accurate to characterize a system as being entirely centralized or decentralized. It is more accurate to think of degrees of centralization or decentralization. In addition the degrees of centralization or decentralization may vary among the many functions of the organization.

Structures for vocational education exist within a context within a country which includes many dimensions such as size of country, the overall government structure, the level of development of the country, and the history of the governance structure.

It is not the purpose of this paper to judge the goodness of one type organizational structure or pattern of delegation over another but rather to raise questions about possible strengths and weaknesses.

The United States

The delivery of vocational and technical education in the United States is definitely affected by the degree of authority, funding and leadership from the various levels. Earlier a general description of the administration of vocational and technical education was provided. In summary, it was pointed out that the authority for education resides primarily in the states. However, federal funding has been provided in support of vocational education beginning with the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. This legislation and that which has followed has provided not only financial support but has greatly influenced direction of programs. In addition to the funding voted by the US Congress and its administration by the Executive Branch, the Department of Education, the US Supreme Court has also made decisions which have provided direction.

The prime responsibility for all education is a function of the state. This has been described earlier in this paper. Also, there has been a general discussion about the delegation to district or local levels which varies within each state. Particularly, at the K-12 level, the pattern of administration puts great stress on local control.

There has always been some tension about the "right" balance in control, influence and financing of vocational education. States are not required by law to accept federal funds, however, it is interesting to note that in a very short time after the Smith-Hughes Act was passed in 1917 all States complied with the requirements of the federal legislation in order to participate in the funding. While states from time to time have protested certain provisions in legislation or in the regulations written by the Executive Branch of the federal government, history does not indicate that any state has not participated in federal funding for vocational education in any year over a span of some 70 years up to and including 1988.

There would be general agreement that the federal influence of vocational and technical legislation has been far greater than the percentage of funding provided might suggest. At the same time the unevenness throughout the country in terms of the quality and nature of vocational and technical programs might suggest that the federal influence has not been as great as it should be in bringing about some uniformity of opportunity to all of its citizens. Also, it might be suggested that the federal government has limited opportunities to require successful innovations to be adopted across the states.

Historically, one can point to several major changes that federal funding and leadership have brought about in vocational education. For example, the National Defense Act of 1958 (PL 85-864) authorized $15 million annually for five years for training highly skilled technicians. There can be little doubt that this act with somewhat modest funding encouraged many states to develop two year associate degree programs in technical areas.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210) caused states to develop a more comprehensive program in that it provided funding for all occupations not requiring a four year degree instead of providing funds for the traditional categories of occupations of agriculture, trade and industries, marketing and home economics.

In addition, the Act took on a more social character by setting aside funds for disadvantaged. The Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 (PL 98-524), recognizing the concern for special groups such as disadvantaged and handicapped, set aside a large percentage of the authorization to encourage states to develop programs serving these groups.

The above are only illustrations of the fact that at the federal level funding for vocational education has targeted national concerns and thus has encouraged states through funding to extend programs in certain directions considered desirable by Congress.

This federal influence and funding has been healthy for vocational education. It has encouraged states to expand in directions that were thought to be in the national interest. At the same time, states continue to have primary responsibility for vocational and technical education. In a sense there is some sharing of policy making which seems to have worked exceeding well.

There is considerable difference among states in the degree of centralization of control and funding for vocational education at the high school level. While most citizens have championed the idea of local control, complete local control does not seem best for the delivery of vocational education.

Local school districts often have too small a pupil base to provide a comprehensive vocational program. Funding is also a problem to provide the faculty and equipment necessary for quality programs. Some states have provided legislature and funding to encourage or require area schools that serve several school districts as a solution. Other states have encouraged articulated programs with postsecondary institutions.

In terms of funding, there has been generally across the country resistance to increased local property taxes which have traditionally been the main source of financing K-12 schools. The tendency in a number of states has been to increase the level of state funding. Also, the quality issue has become highlighted in recent years with requirements for curriculum and other program dimensions being increased by states. So that complete local control is somewhat a myth. However, local elected boards have a substantial of authority as delegated by the state.

Iraq

The centralized system of administration of vocational education in Iraq seems to be working well at this time in the development of the countries workforce. There are a number of reasons that would suggest that it is the preferred system at least at this time. First the country is not large in either area or population. In addition, it has a similar culture throughout the country and similar economic conditions.

In terms of financing vocational education, the central government is the level that is best equipped to raise the funds and distribute them. The central government is also the most logical organization to attract and employ the technical manpower necessary to provide direction to the system.

One of the goals in Iraq is to provide equal opportunity for vocational training in all areas of the country. The centralized system provides a framework through which there can be a planned distribution of financial resources and educational personnel.

The centralized system, also, provides for the maximum use of planning and administrative personnel that are available. It seems more efficient to plan and administer programs from a central location. At this time, a local funded and administered program would probably not be successful because there is a lack of understanding of the need and value of for such programs at the local level.

The centralization of the administration of vocational education in Iraq provides the potential for: a) high quality planning, b) effective development of vocational education, c) harmony, integration, and the exchange of experiences throughout the country, and d) the providing and transferring of resources as needed among the vocational schools and technical institutes

While at this time the advantages of a centralized system suggests that it is the best choice for Iraq, such a system is not without problems which will be discussed briefly in the following paragraphs.

Among the challenges of a central system is how to make decisions that are responsive to local needs or conditions. Decisions may be ideal from a overall point of view but may not take into account all of the conditions that prevail in a region or other local area.

In a bureaucracy there may be inefficient handling of problems which creates complexities of administration at lower levels. This leads to unmet goals, and lost time. Because of the centralization of authority, personnel at lower levels may not assume responsibility for decisions.

Evaluation of activities in a school is a great challenge for centralized administrative personnel. Such evaluation sometimes leads to a loss of resources and time. Once a decision has been made there is often great reluctance to change.

The lack of direct communication between local schools and those in decision making positions causes a lack of enthusiasm among local leaders and, therefore, the advancement of the vocational program may not be optimum.

A centralized system places limits on the opportunity to develop a broad base of leadership expertise since decisions are usually made at the highest level of administration. A greater delegation of decision making would provide leaders with the experience necessary to develop leadership skills.

Conclusions

A comparison of the vocational and technical education systems in the USA and Iraq lead to the following conclusions:

1. While the vocational education system in Iraq is thought of as a centralized system, local administrators have authority to make some decisions and in addition contribute to the planning, and policy making at the central level of the vocational education administration.

   In the case of the vocational education system in the USA, despite of the strong decentralization of administration, their is some degree of centralization of authority at both the state and federal levels.

2. Since the first vocational education act, the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, there has been a federal interest in vocational education despite the fact that the main authority and responsibility for education was delegated in the Constitution of the United States to the states.

3. While the overall percentage of funding for vocational education has not keep pace with the growth in the program nationally, now estimated to be about 10 percent of total funding as a nationwide average, the federal impact on programs throughout the years has been dramatic.

3. The degree of decentralization in vocational education from the state to district or local level varies throughout the USA. It is commonly accepted that the function of education is a responsibility of the state, however, the degree of delegation of authority to lower levels and the level of funding by the state is quite uneven. The delegation at the secondary level to local boards of education and the dependence of the local property tax as a primary means of supporting school is much more universal for secondary schools than for postsecondary.

Using Wisconsin as an example, for the year 1985-86, the state provided $78 million or approximately 22 percent of the cost for the Vocational, Technical and Adult Education System, which is the postsecondary system of vocational education. Local tax support from property taxes averaged about 50 percent of the total support. There is a strong consensus that the state should be providing a larger part of the funding thus lowering property tax. In terms of governance, presently the primary control is at the district level through

appointed boards of education. There continues to be some tension on the degree to which authority is delegated and it appears to be a foregone conclusion that if the percentage of state funds is increased that there will be increased administrative authority exercised at the state level.

In 1986-87 school year 45 states (90 percent) provided separate or additional state financial aids to secondary school vocational education programs. The basis upon which funds were distributed and amounts varied from state to state. The most common method for distributing state funds to secondary programs is on a per pupil or per class basis.

The fact that final responsibility for education rests with the state, even though much authority is delegated to local boards; and the fact that states exercise accountability for the appropriate expenditure of state funds, places the state in a strong position of oversight of vocational education programs.

4. In general in the United States, the decentralization of the administration of education provides local communities the opportunity to play a major role in shaping their educational program. Using Wisconsin as an example, many secondary school districts have chosen not to place much emphasis on vocational education. Only recently has state legislation been passed that requires that vocational education opportunities be made available to students in all districts. Even with this mandate the local district has a great latitude in how they meet the requirement.

   At the postsecondary level in Wisconsin, approximately 50 percent of the cost of operating vocational, technical and adult education programs comes from local real estate taxes. District boards have taxing authority, authority to employ the director and staff, and in general authority to establish or discontinue programs.

5. The decentralization of vocational education in the United States encourages a number of practices that seem to have merit.

   a. Strong relationships between vocational programs and local business and industry. Representatives from business and industry cooperate with schools in determining what programs should be provided and the content of the program.

   b. Articulation between postsecondary and secondary programs is possible through arrangements that can be made at the local level.

   c. Postsecondary programs, particularly, can not only develop customized programs to meet the immediate needs of local employers but also can provide consultive services.

   d. Business and industry representative participate with school personnel through service on advisory committees for each occupational area. They are helpful in many ways including: recommending and evaluating programs, recommending and selection of equipment, recruitment of faculty, and placement of graduates.

6. While the certification requirements for administrators of vocational and technical education are established at the state level and therefore vary, education requirements are similar or the same as those for administrators of academic programs but in addition often require occupational experience in the private sector. Most administrators of vocational and technical education programs in the United States hold at least a master's degree in education.

7. The most common organizational pattern for post secondary vocational and technical education in the United States is the community college which includes the first two years of a four year college program and vocational and technical programs. In addition they have strong adult education programs. In the case of technical institutes there is often cooperation with academic institutions.

8. In Iraq, even though the system is much more centralized than the system in the United States, local administrators have some opportunity to contribute to the development of policy made at the central level of government. Local administrators are involved in determining the local needs and providing this information to the central agencies. This contribution of local administrators enables the central agencies rational decisions regarding local programs.

9. It is desirable, in Iraq, to strengthen cooperation between vocational education institutions and the production and service sectors of the local area in order to provide better training and retraining to meet specific job needs. Local vocational education institutions need to be provided the resources and flexibility to serve employers in a more timely and effective way.

10. The centralized education administration structure in Iraq has the potential to promote articulation between general secondary schools and vocational secondary schools. There is a need for general secondary school students to be exposed to technology, careers and the world of work, including exploratory experiences, as a part of their education

11. The centralized educational administration in Iraq has the potential through the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education to carry out articulation between vocational secondary schools and technical institutes.

Recommendations

The recommendations which follow are a result of the authors in-depth experience in vocational and technical education in their respective countries, Jamal Mezel's nine months of study in the United States, Merle Strong's broad experience with education and manpower programs internationally, and numerous discussions between the authors.

The several recommendations are followed by a short descriptive explanation designed to clarify or provide rationale for the recommendation.

United States

1. Recommendation

That the federal government should strengthen funding and leadership in vocational and technical education at the national level.

> Statement - It is in the national interest that the United States have a well trained workforce in order to compete on the world market and to maintain world leadership. Also, it is important that all citizens have the opportunity for preparation for the workforce. Federal funding and leadership have helped to provide access by special needs groups.

2. Recommendation

That the federal government increase funding and leadership in research and evaluation of vocational, technical and other workforce related types of programs.

> Statement - Research is needed to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of education and training and other programs designed to prepare individuals for the work world. Funding and leadership from the national level can promote research, development and evaluation on large issues that will impact the quality and delivery of education and training nationally.

3. Recommendation

That the federal government reestablish a system for training leadership for vocational and technical education and training.

> Statement - The growth in technology and the complexities of developing and maintaining quality programs to meet future workforce needs provides a great challenge. Federal funding for leadership is needed to help assure adequately trained leadership

4. Recommendations

That the federal government should encourage and support financially, increased participation in international vocational and technical education.

> Statement - Increased participation would encourage the sharing of information on education and training with other countries to increase their effectiveness and at the same time knowledge gained would be useful to U.S. programs.

Iraq

1. Recommendation

That Iraq seek to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of vocational education through modification of its centralized administrative structure.

> Statement - Iraq's centralized system of administration of vocational and technical education is serving Iraq well and should be continued in substantially its present form. However, leaders should consider developing a plan for delegation of certain authority and responsibility to the local level. Such delegation should improve efficiency as a result of having certain decision making take place closer to the setting where education and training is taking place. The Central government may wish to function more as a policy making organization and delegate many of the operating functions.

2. Recommendation

Administrators at the local level should seek to develop closer working relationships with business and industry.

> Statement - The benefits to such relationships are potentially very great. Business and industry can provide a great range of different types of assistance to schools from technical advice to actual support through the providing of equipment. Schools can assist industry by attempting to better meet their needs through better trained workers. Schools are often in a position to provide customized training designed to meet specific and immediate needs of industry.

3. Recommendation

Vocational and technical schools should contract with general education schools to provide exploratory types of experiences related to the world of employment.

> Statement - All students should be provided an understanding of the world of work and have exposure to practical skills and education about technology, for living in an industrialized society.

Such instruction should help in making career decisions and should enhance their potential for benefiting from postsecondary education.

4. Recommendation

Cooperation and greater communication should be developed between and among technical institutes.

> Statement - It is one of the successful ways of sharing experiences, expertise, and best practices resulting in increased quality in programs.

5. Recommendation

Technical institutes should interrelate more effectively with the community of which they are apart.

Statement - There are a number of ways to structure this interaction. One very effective means is through the use of occupational advisory committees for each occupational area. Adult education courses should be promoted, designed to meet specific needs identified by employers or employees. Also, cooperative experiences can be developed for students with employers.

6. Recommendation

Leadership personnel in technical schools should have experience and training in educational administration as well as a technical background.

Statement - The operation of a technical school is a very complex task. In addition to understanding the needs of business and industry, it is important for administrators to have sound administrative training in such areas as: program planning, budgeting, curriculum development, personnel administration, student administration, facilities planning, community relations, and evaluation of programs and students.

7. Recommendation

Funding should be made available to carry out an ongoing program of evaluation and research.

Statement - Evaluation and research is a necessary component for the development of effective and efficient programs. It should be planned, continuous, and adequately funded.